## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,816	07/09/2003	Graham Roger Jones	YAMAP0880US	1433
	7590 09/06/200 KALINO (GENERAL)	EXAMINER		
RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP 1621 EUCLID AVENUE, NINETEENTH FLOOR CLEVELAND, OH 44115-2191			WONG, ALLEN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Ź	,		2621	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/615,816	JONES ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Allen Wong	2621	

	Allen Wong	2621	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appo	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>10 August 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOI	R ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a N (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compositioning time periods:</li> </ol>	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a lotice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	affidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (	ence, which CFR 41.31; or
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this Ad event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	visory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of ). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE F f).	of the final rejection. IRST REPLY WAS FILE	D WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date or been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened s above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three montl earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. latutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comof filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)	)), to avoid dismissal (	of the appeal.
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection (a) They raise new issues that would require further c (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE bel	onsideration and/or search (see NC ow);	OTE below);	
<ul> <li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a</li> </ul>	a corresponding number of finally re		the issues for
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)		Samualiant Amanadaan	- (DTOL 324)
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(</li> </ul>		ompliant Amendmen	(PTOL-324).
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be the non-allowable claim(s).		e, timely filed amendn	nent canceling
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pr The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-47.		vill be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) vithdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			•
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, I because applicant failed to provide a showing of good a and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filin entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.  10. The affidavit are able to identify the	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appears and was not earlier presented.	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)	nils to provide a (1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanati REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attac	cnea.
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered be See Continuation Sheet.	out does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	ance because:
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)	. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	MI	
13. Other:	/	///////////////////////////////////////	
	$\mathcal{L}$	Allen Wong Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2621	
		ALL UIIIL. 202 I	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: although applicant's arguments are understood, however, they are not deemed persuasive. Regarding pages 2-9 of applicant's remarks, applicant states that Woodgate does not disclose the autostereoscopic display including a transreflective spatial light modulator as recited in claims 1 and 24. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In figure 1, Woodgate discloses element 5 that comprises the details of the spatial light modulator 4 in that there is an arrangement of plural preventive transmission elements 5a and 5b for substantially preventing the transmission of light through the at least one first region of the modulator to an autostereoscopic viewing region of the display. In figure 1, Woodgate discloses that element 7 controls the transreflective spatial light modulator within the arrangement as shown in element 5. Thus, Woodgate discloses the control of a transreflective spatial light modulator. Also, in column 4, lines 5-13, Woodgate discloses the polarization means for polarizing certain light frequencies from entering or transmitting through in that these certain light frequencies are reflected back. Polarization is conceptually known for letting some light frequencies pass through while at the same time, the light frequencies that do not pass through (ie. polarized) are reflected back. Woodgate discloses that the SLM (spatial light modulator) comprises polarization means for preventing or reflecting back the unwanted or blocked out light frequencies while letting or permitting the unblocked light frequencies. Thus, the concept of "transreflective" is disclosed in Woodgate's SLM (spatial light modulator). Therefore, Woodgate does teach the autostereoscopic display including a "transreflective spatial light modulator" as recited in claims 1 and 24. Dependent claims are rejected for at least similar reasons as set forth.